



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/641,045	9/641,045 08/17/2000 Kenneth Lee Ha		9209-3	4757
20792 7590 03/30/2004		EXAMINER		
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC			PARTON, KEVIN S	
PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2153	10
			DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004	/0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			pyzy pyzy		
•	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/641,045 HARPER, KENNETH LEE			
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Kevin Parton	2153		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Faile	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.7 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reput or poly is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
	ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).				
Status _					
•	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02/1</u>				
	• • •	s action is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 4	03 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,2,16-21,35 and 36 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 3-15,22-34 and 37-49 is/are objected. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	own from consideration.			
Applicat	tion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	its have been received. Its have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage		
Attachme	• •	o∏	(DTO 442)		
2)	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:			

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/2004 regarding claims 1, 20, and 35 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the following reasons and the associated grounds of rejection below.
- 3. Regarding claims 1, 20, and 35, the applicant argues "merely because the packets monitored in Dawson are directed to a source does not mean Dawson teaches the monitoring recitations of claim 1" (page 2, paragraph 3). The examiner still contends that the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches the determination of a point of loss for packets between a source and a destination. Both source and target metrics can be calculated. Further, in the case that an individual packet is being tested, it would clearly be between a single source and a single destination. The reference still reads on the claims as written.
- 4. The applicant further argues that "determining a topology of a network between a particular source and destination makes no sense in the ring context of Dawson" (page 3, paragraph 1). The argument is not persuasive because it is very important to the function of Dawson that each node knows what nodes are upstream and downstream and the topology of the network. Further, in the applicant's specification page 12, paragraph 2, the topology "determination" is described. The topology data may simply be provided to the data processing system. This is analogous to the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) where the topology is

Art Unit: 2153

either known or provided to the nodes so they know their position in the network. In this passage, determining a network topology makes no sense in the context of the claimed invention because the topology data is known and provided to the system with no determination process. Further, the specification goes on the same paragraph to point out that "the benefits of the present invention may be realized using such topology information regardless of how it is obtained."

- 5. The applicant further argues "given the ring architecture of Dawson, there was simply no impetus to modify Dawson to arrive at the recitations of Claim 1 relating to monitoring data records" (page 3, paragraph 2). Please note that the rejection does not modify the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188), the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) anticipates the current claims because it teaches the determination of a point of lass between a source and a destination.
- The applicant further argues "such a loss calculation is not even in part based on the topology of the ring network" (page 3, paragraph 3). The argument is not persuasive because in the system of Dawson (USPN 5,390,188), the point of loss is determined at an individual node because of the fact that the ring topology is known. Since there is only one path due to the topology, the point of loss can be determined on a per packet or larger basis. Further, any node may be a source or destination so determining metrics for either is possible.
- 7. All further arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection below.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 3-15, 22-34, and 37-49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2153

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 16-21, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dawson (USPN 5,390,188).
- 3. Regarding claims 1, 20, and 35, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches a system for determining a point of loss for records to be communicated between a source and a destination on a communications network with means for:
 - a. Determining a topology of the communication network between the source and the destination, the topology including a plurality of connecting nodes (figure 1). Note that in the reference, the topology is known by all nodes.
 - Monitoring a number of data records from the source directed to the destination passing between ones of the connecting nodes during a determined period of time (column 10, lines 1-13; column 14, lines 58-62).
 - c. Identifying at least one of the connecting nodes as the point of loss based on the monitored number of data records and the determined topology (column 10, lines 1-13; column 14, lines 58-62).
- 4. Regarding claims 2, 21, and 36 Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claims 1, 20 and 35, respectively. He further teaches means wherein a plurality of network appliances configured to obtain a number of data records passing between a pair of

Art Unit: 2153

connecting nodes during a time period are positioned between respective ones of the connecting nodes, with means for:

- a. Identifying at least one of the network appliances on the topology (figure 7;
 column 14, lines 58-62).
- b. Obtaining the number of data records from the source directed to the destination obtained by the identified at least one network appliance during the determined period of time (column 14, lines 58-62; column 15, lines 35-38). Note that in the reference, the loss metrics are sent to management machines for each device.
- 5. Regarding claim 16, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches a system for determining point of loss for data records to be communicated between a source and a destination on a communication network comprising:
 - a. A memory including a topology of the communication network between the source and the destination, the topology including a plurality of connecting nodes (figure 1). Note that in the reference, the topology is known by all nodes.
 - b. A receiver that receives from a plurality of network appliances at determined locations on the communication network a number of data records from the source directed to the destination passing between ones of the connecting nodes during a determined period of time (column 10, lines 1-13; column 14, lines 58-62).

Art Unit: 2153

c. A comparison circuit that identifies at least one of the connecting nodes as the point of loss based on the received number of data records, the locations of the network appliances and the topology (column 10, lines 1-13, 26-32).

- 6. Regarding claim 17, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 16. He further teaches means wherein pairs of the connecting nodes define segments of the topology between the source and the destination and wherein at least one of the network appliances is coupled between each of the pairs of the connecting nodes (figure 1; figure 9).
- 7. Regarding claim 18, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 17. He further teaches:
 - a. A timer (column 14, lines 58-62).
 - b. A filter that identifies ones of a plurality of data records detected by the at least one of the network appliances that are being transmitted from the source to the destination on the communications network (column 10, lines 1-13).
 - c. A counter that counts filtered one of the plurality of data records, the counter being configured to be reset responsive to the timer; and a transmitter that transmits counts from the counter to the receiver (column 14, lines 58-62; column 15, lines 35-47)
- 8. Regarding claim 19, Dawson (USPN 5,390,188) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 17. He further teaches means wherein the filter is configured to identify ones of the plurality of data records based on the source Internet Protocol (IP) address and destination IP address of a data packet containing data records detected by the at least one of the network

Art Unit: 2153

appliances (figure 1, figure 9; column 10, lines 1-13). Note that all packets are filtered based on the destination address.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin Parton Examiner Art Unit 2153

ksp

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100